

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-7 stand rejected as indefinite. Applicant traverses.

The Examiner indicates that he does not understand how a finger could shield an interior of the cage. Applicant would point out that the actual limitation is "at least one" finger, which means that it can be any number of fingers forming the shield. Applicant further points out that this limitation was in the original claim 1, and therefore is most certainly included in the original disclosure. Applicant further points out that a single finger could be as wide as the interior of the cage, and could thus protect the interior as claimed.

2. Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected as anticipated by Jones. Claims 1 and 5-7 stand rejected as anticipated by Hwang. Applicant traverses.

Applicant has amended claim one to include the restriction that the fingers protrude upward from the main body of the lower surface of the cage.

The Examiner has still not proposed any element in either Jones or Hwang that could be considered the equivalent of one or more projecting fingers, as has been claimed throughout.

In order to anticipate or to render obvious claims, the prior art must disclose or indicate all the elements of the claims. In this instance, there is no reference in the cited prior art that teaches an integral rear intermediate EMI gasket formed from upward protruding fingers as is claimed in present claims 1 and 3. All other present claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, the prior art cannot be said to anticipate or to render obvious the present claims.

3. Claims 5-7 stand rejected as anticipated by Hwang. Applicant traverses.

As pointed out in the separate application (serial number 10/402,751, filed 03/28/03)

that covers the connecting legs only, and has recently issued at patent number 6,764,318, issued Jul. 20, 2004, Hwang discloses the "eye of needle" pins known in the art. These pins are flat with an opening stamped in a central area to form two flat legs. As discussed at some length in application 10/402,751, the type of connecting legs disclosed in the prior art do not meet the restrictions of claim 5, which includes the restrictions of issued patent 6,764,318, claim 1, verbatim. In light of this finding of patentability, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 5-7.


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant now asserts that all of the grounds for rejection have been traversed or overcome by amendment, and that all of the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and solicits allowance of the present claims at an early date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2004

Registration No: 32,737
Telephone: (408) 778-3440



Keith Kline
THE KLINE LAW FIRM, P.C.
14910 Bonner Court
Morgan Hill, CA 95037-5925